

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 13-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment claims, 1, 7 and 13-16 are amended and claims 5-6 and 8-12 have been cancelled. Claims 17-26 are new. Example support for the amendments herein may be found at Para. [0031-0034] and Fig. 2 of Applicants' application. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 13, 14, 15, and 16 are the independent claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Kato/Hirayama

Claims 1-4, 7 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication No. 2005/0019007 (hereinafter, "Kato") in view of US Patent No. 5,630,006 (hereinafter, "Hirayama"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Claim 1 recites *inter alia*, "a navigation area configured to store a plurality of navigation segments including at least one navigation command for launching a playlist, the playlist including a playitem indicating a playing interval in a clip of the video data, and the navigation segments including a first navigation segment and a second navigation segment." The Examiner relies on paragraphs [0027, 0031, 00184] and Figs. 9 and 15 of Kato, to disclose the above limitations. However, as disclosed at Para. [0191, 0206] of Kato, a "user selects the Playlist, desired to be reproduced, from the lists of Playlists." Further, as described at Para. [0188] of Kato, a playlist is described as "a database of a group (PlayList) of playback domains (PlayItem)." Thus, as a user directly selects a "Playlist" in Kato, Kato fails to disclose "at least"

one navigation command for launching a playlist,” as recited in claim 1. Moreover, as the “Playlists” in Kato are only disclosed to be stored in a database, Kato fails to disclose “a navigation area configured to store a plurality of navigation segments including at least one navigation command for launching a playlist,” and “a first navigation segment and a second navigation segment,” as recited in claim 1.

Amended claim 1 recites *inter alia*, that “the navigation commands included in the first navigation segment and the second navigation segment launch different playlists respectively such that the first navigation segment and the second navigation segment represent different reproduction paths of a title of the video data.” The Examiner relies on Col. 5, Ln. 39 – Col. 6, Ln. 62 of Hirayama to teach the above limitation. However, Col. 5, Ln. 39 – Col. 6, Ln. 62 of Hirayama only disclose a “multi-scene” format where at certain points in a “program movement,” “a menu is displayed” and “the user can select” from one of multiple scenes using “program bars.” Moreover, as disclosed at Col. 5, Ln. 34-38 and shown in Figs. 3A-3B, the “program movement” is a data “stream,” and segments of the stream are “program bars,” with each bar “composed of a plurality of data units.” Hence, Hirayama only discloses allowing a user to select between different data segments. Thus, Hirayama does not disclose “a navigation area configured to store a plurality of navigation segments including at least one navigation command for launching a playlist,” as recited in claim 1. As a result, Hirayama also fails to disclose that “the navigation commands included in the first navigation segment and the second navigation segment launch different playlists respectively such that the first navigation segment and the second navigation segment represent different reproduction paths of a title of the video data,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Kato and Hirayama. Even assuming *arguendo* that Kato and Hirayama are combinable (which Applicants do not admit),

Hirayama still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kato with respect to claim 1. Independent claims 13 and 14 recite similar limitations to claim 1, and therefore, are patentable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-4, 7 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection to the above claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Kato/Hirayama/Sasaki

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Hirayama in further view of US Patent Publication No. 7,050,384 (hereinafter, “Sasaki”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Even assuming *arguendo* that Kato, Hirayama, and Sasaki are combinable (which Applicants do not admit), Sasaki still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kato and Hirayama with respect to claim 1. Independent claims 15 and 16 are at least somewhat similar to claim 1 and therefore patentable for at least somewhat similar reasons. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection to the above claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 17-26 are patentable for reasons somewhat similar to those discussed above with respect to previously presented claims 2-4, noting that each claim should be interpreted separately, based solely upon its own limitations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura, at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/NKP:aem